

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL ACTION

The following is Applicant's response to the Examiner's 02/07/2008 Non-Final Action to Application Number 10/554,022.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In response to the Examiner's 103 (a) rejections to claims 1, 3-6, 13, 14, and 17-21 based on Davis et al. (U.S. Patent Application Number: 2005/0020288, hereinafter "Davis") in view of McLaughlin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Number: 2005/0058049, hereinafter "McLaughlin") the applicant has amended all dependent claims by amending Claim 1. Claim 21 has been cancelled. All previously rejected claims 1, 3-6, 13, 14, and 17-20 now include three additional steps of creating a unique i/d, assigning the unique i/d to the voice message, and embedding the unique i/d in the transcribed text message. Further claims 1, 3-6, 13, 14, and 17-20 have further been amended by the removal of the selecting step and the alternative streaming step in Claim 1.

Accordingly it is the applicant's position that the previous 103 (a) rejections to claims 1, 3-6, 13, 14, and 17-20 have been traversed as neither Davis nor McLaughlin, individually or collectively, teach or anticipate the additional amended steps.

In response to the Examiner's 103 (a) rejections to claims 2, 7-12, 15 and 16 based on Davis in view of McLaughlin and further in view of Martin (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,373, hereinafter "Martin") the applicant has amended all dependent by amending Claim 1. All previously rejected claims 2, 7-12, 15 and 16 now include three additional steps of creating a unique i/d, assigning the unique i/d to the voice message, and embedding the unique i/d in the transcribed text message. Further claims 2, 7-12, 15 and 16 have further been amended by the removal of the selecting step and the alternative streaming step in Claim 1.

Accordingly it is the applicant's position that the previous 103 (a) rejections to claims 2, 7-12, 15 and 16 have been traversed as neither Davis, McLaughlin nor Martin, individually or collectively, teach or anticipate the additional amended steps.

The applicant respectfully requests that the amended claims 1-20 should be allowed accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark D. Fox'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name 'Mark' being the most prominent part.

Mark D. Fox, Esq.  
Reg. No. 38,677